

statement of confidence made by the Vietnamese. Any illusion on this score in the camp of the bourgeoisie and its satellites will soon be dispelled.

THE SOVIET REVISIONIST POSITION: KOSYGIN BACKED OVERTHROW OF MAO

The Soviet revisionists are the ones who are most dismayed by the whole development. They think that this may be the beginning of a bloc against the USSR. Even if that were true — and it is as yet a long way from it — they would have no one to blame but themselves. An alliance, to the extent that it exists, is still between the U.S. and the USSR against China.

Do these people think that the world has forgotten the long, vicious campaign by the Moscow leadership to overthrow the revolutionary leadership of Mao Tse-tung? Can anyone have forgotten that it was only a few years ago that Kosygin, the Premier, in a visit to London openly proclaimed his solidarity with Liu Shao-chi and virtually called for the overthrow of the Mao regime. So brazen were Kosygin's remarks that the New York Times asked wistfully "Are you calling for an alliance against China?" and virtually answered "we're going to play it coy."

"We are aware there are today in China," said Kosygin during a visit to London in January-February, 1967, "in the Communist party of China, and in the Chinese Government, people who are struggling against the dictatorial regime of Mao Tsetung." And then he added, "We sympathize with them."

The New York Times, commenting upon this remarkable statement editorialized early in February, 1967: "Mr. Kosygin spoke in his capacity as Premier of the Soviet Union while in the capital of a 'capitalist' nation."

"His point could scarcely have been registered in more arresting fashion if he had said the same thing in front of the White House with President Johnson at his side."

The attacks by the revisionists against the PRC for trying to normalize relations comes in bad grace. Their denunciations are entirely actuated by reactionary considerations — since the USSR leaders have been promoting an accommodation with the U.S. for years in order to isolate People's China. The relationship between Moscow and Washington has become truly scandalous. How can the Soviet leaders turn around now and say "Don't do it," when they themselves have been and still are doing it.

Naturally the revisionists cannot conceive of having normal diplomatic relations with an imperialist country without engaging in class betrayal. In this they are trying to impute their own practices to the Chinese leaders.

Of course U.S. imperialism has always tried to play off the USSR

against China and China against the USSR and always will. This is one of the cornerstones of imperialist foreign policy in the epoch of the emergence of socialist states. It is this policy, aided by the growth of revisionism in the USSR, which is objectively responsible for the split in the socialist camp in the first place.

That being the case, all the more is it incumbent upon the Soviet leadership to abandon its policy of class collaboration with imperialism and return the Soviet Union to a policy of proletarian class collaboration with China, the other revolutionary socialist countries and the world revolutionary movement. Only in that way will the machinations of U.S. imperialism be frustrated.

THE SWP POSITION

Another voice — a neo-social democratic tendency in this country which has been violently opposed to revolutionary China — is that represented by the SWP. In their publication the Intercontinental Press of April 19, they characterize China's attempt at normalization of relations with the U.S. as a "timely assist for Nixon." The SWP too is trying to discredit Chinese attempts to normalize relationships with the imperialist West. They too are arguing from utterly reactionary and counterrevolutionary considerations.

SWP, REVISIONISTS BOTH ATTACKED THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION

One should ask these people, who now throw revolutionary phrases at China: "What was your role during the Cultural Revolution — the revolution which saved China from bourgeois restoration? Which side did you take? Did you not join with the revisionists and give objective aid and assistance to the counterrevolution, although giving different arguments?" The true test of a revolutionary was the position on the Cultural Revolution. Both Moscow and Washington, including all their liberal social democratic allies in this country, were dead set against that revolution. Now suddenly these neo-social democrats are denouncing China for not being revolutionary!

At the time when the social democrats of all hues, including Moscow revisionism, were attacking the Cultural Revolution we wrote the following in Workers World of January 20, 1967:

"The cardinal fact that emerges from the sum and substance of the dispute is that the Chinese CP may be fighting the crucial battle for socialism, which, if lost, would set the proletarian and liberation movements of the world back for decades. The alternative to the present leadership and its political line, it must be faced squarely, is a neo-bourgeois restorationist regime. That is what really is at stake in the cultural revolution in China." Our article was headlined: "The Stakes in China's Internal Struggle: Revolution vs. Restoration."